

Response
Application No. 10/810,594
Attorney Docket No. 042128

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 16-19 have been amended and claims 4, 8, 12 and 15 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated October 2, 2007.

Drawings:

The drawings stand objected to in item 2 of the Action due to the Examiner contention that reference characters 20 and 30 have both been used to designate a display screen and that reference characters 22 and 32 have both been used to designate a cursor.

Applicant submit that the Examiner's position is over-critical, since it appears that the Examiner has failed to appreciate that the display screen 20 is an example of a display screen for the first client 100a and the display screen 30 is an example of a display screen for the second client 100b. Similarly, the Examiner has also failed to appreciate that the first cursor 32 is a mark which can be moved by the user of a first client 100a on display screen 20 and the third cursor 32 is a mark which can be moved by the user of the second client 100b on display screen 30. Therefore, it is submitted that reference numerals 20, 30 and 22, 32 depicted different displays and cursors, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

Response
Application No. 10/810,594
Attorney Docket No. 042128

As to the Merits:

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner sets forth the following rejection:

claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Salesky et al. (USP 6,343,313).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, now calls for *a providing unit that provides prescribed content to a client; a receiving unit that receives a message including position information which specifies a prescribed position on the content; an extracting unit that extracts the position information from the message; and a transmitting unit that transmits a message including the extracted position information to another client that is browsing the content, wherein the message is an instant message.* Independent claims 5, 9, 13 and 16-19 have been amended in somewhat similar ways.

In the outstanding Action, the Examiner asserts, in the last paragraph on page 4 of the Action, that Salesky discloses in col. 3, lines 42-49 using an instant message software. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is clearly mis-characterizing the teachings of Salesky, since such reference is completely silent with regard to transmitting and receiving instant messages between the clients, the clients and the servers, or the servers.

Instead, Salesky discloses in col. 14, lines 45-58:

In general, the presenter client sends out a stream or streams, which can vary in format over time. The presenter client can also imbed command messages into a stream, such as a command indicating a changed color map, a pointer icon position, or a presentation hand-off command; such commands can also be sent in a separate communications channel. Capture can also occur in buffers for other purposes than screen display. Streams other than the shared-screen conferencing stream (outlined above and described in more detail below) can carry information to allow shared or broadcast text chat, audio, video, drawing, whiteboarding, and other communications. These streams are subject to and can enjoy the same or similar load/need analysis and balancing methods and mechanisms.

That is, while Salesky clearly discloses that the presenter client can send out streams with imbedded command messages for indicating, i.e., a pointer icon position, Salesky simply fails to include any disclosure regarding transmitting, receiving or providing such information in instant messages, as now called for in each of the independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 16-19.

Accordingly, since Salesky is silent with transmitting, receiving or providing imbedded command messages in instant messages, it is submitted that Salesky fails to teach each and every features of claim 1, regarding *a providing unit that provides prescribed content to a client; a receiving unit that receives a message including position information which specifies a prescribed position on the content; an extracting unit that extracts the position information from the message; and a transmitting unit that transmits a message including the extracted position information to another client that is browsing the content, wherein the message is an instant*

Response
Application No. 10/810,594
Attorney Docket No. 042128

message. Further, it is submitted that independent claims 5, 9, 13 and 6-19 are not anticipated by Salesky for somewhat similar reasons.


In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicant submits that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Thomas E. Brown
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,450
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/nrp